

SYMBOLGY CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM			
CHANGE PROPOSAL NUMBER		MIL03-08	
ORIGINATOR	SPONSOR	DATE RECEIVED	DATE OF ACTION
SPAWAR	NAVY	March 31, 2003	July 24, 2003
CHANGE PROPOSAL TITLE			
Incorrect Designation of Frame Shape Modifiers			
SUGGESTED CHANGE			
<p>1. <u>STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:</u> Feedback received from EUCOM where the COP is used to monitor Iraq indicated that operators are unable to distinguish "Friend" from "Assumed Friend" because they are represented by the same MIL-STD 2525 symbol. In addition, when operators turned on the "E" field decoration to display the frame shape modifier, they found the "?" to be too small to be legible, given the symbol size they were using to display the operational picture.</p> <p>2. <u>PROBLEM ANALYSIS:</u></p> <p>a. Table I of MIL-STD 2525B defines the frame shapes for depicting affiliation, some of which are distinguished by the addition of a "U," "J," "K," or "?" decoration outside the frame. Section 5.3.1 indicates that "if any of these modifiers is displayed in a symbol, it is considered to be an integral part of the frame." However, per Table III of the MIL-STD, the frame shape modifier is an optional decoration, not a required part of the symbol frame. The COP implemented symbology in accordance with the MIL-STD, which resulted different affiliations being represented by the same symbol.</p> <p>b. COP operators frequently use smaller-size symbols to manage display clutter when monitoring an area of interest where symbols overlap or are collocated. MIL-STD 2525 symbols need to be designed so operators can identify affiliation when the symbols are rendered at different sizes, including ones that are very small. Operators should not have to increase symbol size in order to make the decoration legible, knowing that in doing so, they will be increasing display clutter.</p> <p>3. <u>PROPOSED SOLUTION:</u></p> <p>a. Revise Sections 5.3.1 and 5.3.4, Figure 3, and Table III to ensure that the decoration indicating uncertainty of identity (e.g., assumed friend) is a required component of the symbol frame. In addition, include examples in Appendix A that show symbols representing these affiliations, in order to minimize the misconception that the four affiliations currently shown represent the full set of valid frame shapes.</p> <p>b. Determine, via prototyping and user testing as appropriate, the extent to which the "E" field decoration is legible at symbol sizes required by operational users for situation awareness. If the decoration cannot be made legible at small symbol sizes, recommend revisiting the visualization rules used in the MIL-STD to determine if a different graphic attribute should be used to represent the affiliation categories that make use of this decoration. For example, in previous versions of the COP, uncertainty of identity was indicated by using a dashed-line frame.</p> <p>4. <u>ALTERNATE SOLUTIONS:</u> Not provided.</p> <p>5. <u>AFFECTED DOCUMENTATION:</u> Not provided.</p> <p>6. <u>IMPACT ON OTHER STANDARDS:</u> Not provided.</p> <p>7. <u>INCORPORATION DATE:</u> Not provided.</p> <p>8. <u>OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:</u> Not provided.</p> <p>9. <u>REFERENCES:</u> Not provided.</p> <p>10. <u>ATTACHMENTS:</u> None.</p>			

SYMBOLGY CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM			
CHANGE PROPOSAL NUMBER		MIL03-08	
ORIGINATOR	SPONSOR	DATE RECEIVED	DATE OF ACTION
SPAWAR	NAVY	March 31, 2003	July 24, 2003
CHANGE PROPOSAL TITLE			
Incorrect Designation of Frame Shape Modifiers			
DECISION NOTICE			
Approved as modified at SSMC 2-03.			
Modify Paragraph 5.3.4 to state that Field E is required/mandatory.			